



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/814,399	03/22/2001	Dov Weiss	9124.129US01	3822

23552 7590 03/27/2003

MERCHANT & GOULD PC
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

LE, UYEN T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/814,399

Applicant(s)

WEISS ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen T Le

Art Unit

2171



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In the preliminary amendment, Applicant inadvertently canceled claim 20 when applicant requested that original numbered claims 21-25 to be canceled.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 8, line 6, "in" should be – is—for the sentence to be correct.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to because of many typographical errors and incomplete nomenclature for example at Figures 6, 11 . A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 3, line 7 "in" should be – is --. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent

Art Unit: 2171

granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kisor et al (US 5,978,847).

Regarding claim 1, Kisor discloses a method of carrying out a search of web sites according to a search criteria (see column 2, lines 30-52). The claimed step (a) is met when Kisor shows that contents of web pages are indexed. The claimed step (b) is met when Kisor shows that the contents of web pages are classified. The claimed step (c) is met when Kisor shows that a web page typically contains among other things textual content, embedded graphics and tables (see column 1, lines 39-41). The claimed step (d) is met when Kisor shows that the method retrieves and displays the search results (see Figures 8-10, column 5, line 55- column 6, line 55). Clearly the formed site results of Web_page1, Web_page2,...of Kisor are divided into pre-indexed groups and each site is displayed according to its visual formulation because each web page has a set of attributes for example text, image, sound clip.

Regarding claim 3, Kisor discloses the claimed features when Kisor shows that the files include embedded links of text, image, sound clip (see column 6, lines 11-14).

Claim 5 merely reads on the fact that all web sites inherently consist of a number of bytes.

Claim 6 merely reads on the fact that text, graphics and audio clips in the method of Kisor are clearly distinguishable visual presentations of the attributes of a web page.

Art Unit: 2171

6. Claims 13, 14, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (e) as being anticipated by Levin et al (US 6,434,556).

Regarding claim 13, Levin discloses a method for visually presenting a set of properties of a Web site (see the abstract). The claimed steps (a) is met when Levin shows that the method maps to predetermined areas of the display space according to the relevance of the group. The claimed step (b) is met when Levin shows that the most relevant group is positioned in the central region of the display space for example (see column 3, lines 44-59).

Regarding claim 14, clearly the graphical representation in the method of Levin is 2D (see Figure 1).

Regarding claim 17, Levin discloses a method for finding sub-groups having a common basis in a set of Web sites when Levin shows the hits that are logically related to each other are grouped together (see column 3, lines 44-49). The claimed step (a) is met when Levin shows hyperlinks and cross-connectivity between hits (see column 4, lines 9-58). The claimed step (b) is met by the fact that the method of Levin takes into consideration the content of the pages (see column 4, lines 27-35).

7. Claims 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (e) as being anticipated by Jacobson et al (US 6,338,058).

Regarding claim 19, Jacobson discloses all the claimed subject matter including a spider application, a database application, an indexing application and a seeker application (see the abstract, Figures 1-5, column 3, line 33- column 5, line 16).

Regarding claim 20, the claimed visual application is met by the fact that the system of Jacobson presents address and document attributes in the results of the query (see Figure 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kisor et al (US 5,978,847), in view of Krellenstein (US 5,924,090).

Regarding claim 2, although Kisor does not specifically show grouping by a clustering process, it is well known in the art to group by clustering as shown by Krellenstein (see column 3, lines 11-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed feature while implementing the method of Kisor in order to take advantage of a well known grouping technique.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kisor et al (US 5,978,847), in view of Brown et al (US 5,875,446).

Regarding claim 4, although Kisor does not explicitly show that the importance of a web site is a function of the hyperlinks pointing to and from a web site, it is well known in the art to use such a criteria for ranking a web site as shown by Brown (see column 5,

lines 22-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed feature in order to objectively rank a web site.

10. Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kisor et al (US 5,978,847), in view of Woods et al (US 5,956,039).

Regarding claims 7, 8, Kisor discloses that web sites include graphics presentation of each web site but does not explicitly show that the web site is presented as a building with height or width proportional to the importance or amount of information as claimed. However, it is well known in the art to represent a web site by a building site as shown by Woods (see column 2, lines 48-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features while implementing the method of Kisor and Woods in order to graphically represent the relevancy or amount of information of each web site.

Regarding claims 9-11, although Kisor and Woods do not specifically show an office, a house or a campus as claimed, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features in order to allow users to readily identify each web site by its category.

Regarding claim 12, although Kisor and Woods do not specifically show a display window at the building, it is well known in the art to shop online at web sites. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features in order to identify web sites that allow electronic shopping.

11. Claims 15, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin et al (US 5,870,559), in view of Woods et al (US 5,956,039).

Regarding claim 15, although Levin does not specifically show that the web site representation is a building, it is well known in the art to represent a web site by a building site as shown by Woods (see column 2, lines 48-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed web site representation in order to allow users to navigate to a web site of a company by clicking on its building site.

Regarding claim 16, although Levin does not specifically show that a group of web sites is presented as a street and each web site in said group is presented as a building, it is well known in the art for users to navigate through the streets of a city and hyperlink to a particular company's home web page by clicking on the company's building site as shown by Woods (see column 2, lines 47-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed features in order to allow users to hyperlink to a company's web site by clicking to its representation on a map.

12. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levin et al (US 5,870,559), in view of Kanaegami et al (US 5,297,039).

Regarding claim 18, although Levin does not specifically show detecting keywords frequently used in a determined group, it is well known in the art to use keyword frequency to analyze the content of text information as shown by Kanaegami

(see column 2, lines 7-19, column 4, lines 52-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed feature while implementing the method of Levin in order to determine the content of the hits based on keywords.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lee et al (US 6,466,970) teach collecting and analyzing information about content requested in a network (World Wide Web) environment.

Mills (US 6,397,219) teaches network based classified information systems.

Edelstein et al (US 6,101,537), (US 5,764,906) teach universal electronic resource denotation, request and delivery system.

Tilt et al (US 6,360,235) teach objective measurement and graph theory modeling of web sites.

Leshem et al (US 5,870,559) teach analysis and management of web sites.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers

Art Unit: 2171

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

- 

Uyen Le
March 23, 2003